## IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 4711 of 1985

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE H.L.GOKHALE

\_\_\_\_\_\_

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
- 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
- 3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of judgment?
- 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder?
- 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

\_\_\_\_\_

-----

GUJARAT STATE GAZETTED OFFICERS' UTKARSH MANDAL

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

\_\_\_\_\_

Appearance:

MR YAJNIK for MR GIRISH PATEL for Petitioner Mr B.Y. MANKAD, AGP for Respondent No. 1 MR BP TANNA for Respondent No. 2

-----

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE H.L.GOKHALE

Date of decision: 21/02/97

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Heard Mr Yajnik for Mr Patel for the

petitoner-association representing the backward class employees of the State of Gujarat and Mr B.Y. Mankad, Asst. Government Pleader, for respondent no.1. Respondent no.2 is served.

2 As the petitioner states that some time in 1984-85 there was an agitation of the employees belonging to the higher caste seeking to abolish the roster system which is beneficial to the Scheduled Castes and Tribes and other employees of the reserved categories. It also appears that an agreement was arrived at on 18.8.1995 between the first respondent-Government and the representatives of the Government employees belonging to higher castes who were on strike at that time. It was apprehended that as a result of the agreement, the roster system will be abolished and therefore this petition was filed before this Court.

3 On notice being issued to the State Government, it filed an reply in the month of October 1985 and in para 3 thereof it has been specifically stated by the Joint Secretary, Government of Gujarat, General Administration Department, that the Government has not agreed to and does not intend to agree to abolition of roster system in promotion in the government services. The petition came to be subsequently admitted on 23.12.1985, though, apparently, in view of this reply no interim relief was necessary and hence the same was not granted.

4 Mr Mankad states that the same position continues as of now and there is no plan to abolish roster system in any manner whatsoever. In view of this statement of Mr Mankad, there is no reason for Mr Yajnik to press the petition any further. The same is in the circumstances disposed of as not pressed. Rule is discharged.

\* \* \*